RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 18 2006

REMARKS

The Applicants do not believe that examination of this respons e will result in the introduction of new matter into the present application for invention. Therefore, the Applicants, respectfully, request that this response be entered in and that the claims to the present application, kindly, be reconsidered.

The Office Action dated July 18, 2006 has been received and considered by the Applicants. Claims 1-20 are pending in the present applic tion for invention. Claims 1-20 are rejected by the July 18, 2006 Office Action.

The Office Action rejects Claims 1, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 18 19 an 20 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the specification to the present invention, page 1 and page 2, lines 1-15. The Applicant points out that the rejected claims define subject mater for an inte net receiving arrangement for receiving information data and having quality tes means for testing the information data retrieved and received by the informa ion retrieval means and for supplying the activation information to the address retrieval means when the quality of the received information data is below a quality threshold value or when no information data processable by the inte net receiving arrangement are received from the information server. The Offic action alleges that the BI area of the specification for the present invention teaches the quality test means as defined by the rejected claims. Specificall , the rejection alleges that the background description in the specification on pag e 1, lines 20-30 and page 2, lines 5-15 discloses quality test means as defined b the rejected claims. The Applicant, respectfully, disagrees. The BI area of the specification to the present invention states that "server down" is stored wi n the address information of the information server and supplied to the internet r dio upon request (see page 1, lines 20-30) and that it is a problem that no audic is received or heard if the received information data is below a quality thresh ld value. There is no disclosure or suggestion for supplying the activation information to the address retrieval means when the quality of the received

information data is below a quality threshold value within the BI area of the specification to the present invention. Therefore, this rejection is traversed.

The Office Action rejects Claims 3 and 13 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over the BI area of the specification to the present invention (page 1 and page 2, lines 5-15) in view of the admitted prior art Kerbango Radio (hereinafter Kerbango) pages 1-3. The Applicant, respectfully, submits that claims 3 and 13 are allowable due to the dependency on Claims 1 and 11, which have been previously discussed.

The Office Action states that Claims 5-7 and 15-17 are rejected under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over the BI area of the specification to the present invention (page 1 and page 2, lines 5-15) in view Official Notice. The Applicant, respectfully, points out that the text of the office Action contains rejections for Claims 4-7 and 14-17 under this rejection. Therefore, this rejection is addressed as a rejection of Claims 4-7 and 14-17

The MPEP at §2144.03 states that if the Applicant challenges a factual assertion as not properly officially noticed or not properly based upon common knowledge, the examiner must support the finding with adequate evidence.

Regarding Claims 4 and 14, the Applicant asserts that it is not well known within the art for an internet receiving arrangement for the address retrieval means, when the activation information is present, to be adapted to retrieve transcoding address information from the address server, which transcoding address information identifies a transcoding server which is adapted to transcode information data stored in an information server but not processable by the internet receiving arrangement into information data processable by the internet receiving arrangement, and in which the information retrieval means are adapted to retrieve the information data processable by the internet receiving arrangement from the transcoding server identified by the transcoding address information.

Regarding Claims 5 and 15, the Applicant asserts that it is not well

known within the art for an internet receiving arrangement, in which noise generator means are provided and adapted to supply noise information to information data processing means of the internet receiving arrangement duri ıg the time that the activation information is present.

Regarding Claims 6 and 16, the Applicant asserts that it is not well known within the art for an internet receiving arrangement, in which the addı ess retrieval means, when activation information is present, are adapted to retrie e at least two items of collective address information from at least two address se vers connected to the internet.

Regarding Claims 7 and 17, the Applicant asserts that it is no well known within the art for an internet receiving arrangement, which internet receiving arrangement is formed by an internet television set adapted to rece ve and process audio/video data in the form of information data.

The Applicants has adequately traversed the finding of Offic: ıl Notice for the elements discussed above within the rejected claims. Therefc e, the Applicant, respectfully, asserts that the Examiner is in error in the assert on of Official Notice for Claims 4-7 and 14-17. The Applicant's response above as indicated why the noticed facts are not considered to be common knowledg or well known in the art. The Applicant requests that the Examiner produce p: ıor art references that demonstrate that the above discussed subject matter within (laims 4-7 and 14-17 are well known or of common knowledge within the art.

Applicant is not aware of any additional patents, publications, or other information not previously submitted to the Patent and Trademark Office which would be required under 37 C.F.R. 1.99.

In view of the foregoing response, the Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, with such allowance being, respectfully, requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By James D. Leimbach

James D. Leimbach
Patent Attorney Reg. No. 34,374

Please address all correspondence for this application to:
Michael E. Belk, Senior Intellectual Property Counsel
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
Philips Electronics N.A. Corp.
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001 USA
Tel No. (914) 333-9643

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted on this date via facsimile transmission to (571) 273-8300 AND addressed to:
Mail Stop: Amendment
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date of Transmission: October 18, 2006

(Signature) James D. Leimbach
By: James D. Leimbach